

Against the Grain

Volume 24 | Issue 4

Article 14

September 2012

The Benefit of Getting Everyone on the Same Page When it Comes to Usage Statistics

Russell Richey
EBSCO

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/atg>



Part of the [Library and Information Science Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Richey, Russell (2012) "The Benefit of Getting Everyone on the Same Page When it Comes to Usage Statistics," *Against the Grain*: Vol. 24: Iss. 4, Article 14.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7771/2380-176X.6182>

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

The Benefit of Getting Everyone on the Same Page When it Comes to Usage Statistics

by **Russell Richey** (Marketing Research Manager, EBSCO Industries)

As a part of this special issue of *Against the Grain* (ATG) focusing on usage statistics, Editor **Katina Strauch** asked me to collaborate on a survey of ATG readers regarding the role of usage statistics in the library.

Over the 20-plus years I've spent as a marketing researcher, I've had the privilege of conducting studies across a fantastically diverse range of industries and product segments: hunting equipment, kitchen appliances, health-care providers, and sports teams, to mention a few.

So often in conversation, say, over lunch with friends, the question "What are you studying these days?" will come up. Frequently, the subject matter is relevant, if not dear, to those at the table, and it can set up lively discussions during which I get serendipitous, qualitative research insights — and someone may pick up the meal tab, as well!

Over the past few months, though, when friends or family have asked about the studies I'd been conducting and I mentioned that one really interesting project involved, basically, collecting statistics about how people use statistics, the universal response was a blank stare along with a commiserating response: "Wow ... sorry to hear about that."

What my well-meaning sympathizers may not have realized is just how relevant usage statistics are to their everyday lives — from having an impact on the resources available to their college-attending daughters and sons to providing the information scholars and scientists depend on for research that ultimately shapes the consumers' world. Indeed, the study of usage statistics is significant to far more than most people think. And, actually, studying statistics about statistics is fairly fascinating. Here's what our recent survey of ATG readers revealed.

Survey Methodology and Demographics

The survey questionnaire was developed by the EBSCO Corporate Communications department and ATG, with input and advice from **National Information Standards Organization (NISO)** Executive Director **Todd Carpenter**; **Counting Online Usage of Networked Electronic Resources (COUNTER)** Project Director **Peter Shepherd**; and **EBSCO Information Services** Chief Strategist for E-Resource Access and Management Services **Oliver Pesch**.

ATG's subscriber base was invited via email to participate in the Web-based survey. In all, 2,469 invites were sent, and 333 respondents answered; only practicing librarians were allowed to participate in the survey project. In the initial survey question, those who identified themselves as publishers, vendors, and consultants were redirected to the end of the survey, where they could still register for the survey prize-drawing: one of two Nook Tablets.

The survey was fielded from June 6, 2012, to June 18, 2012; 272 qualified respondents participated (not all respondents answered all survey questions, however), for a general margin of error of +/- 5.6% at a 95% confidence interval.


Study Participants Were Experienced and Knowledgeable

Almost nine in ten respondents (86%) were college- or university-based, with the remainder being a cross-section of library professionals working in medical, law, corporate, or government environments. These librarians reported a range of user-base sizes, from smaller user bases ("0 – 2,500 users," 16%) to large institutions ("more than 25,000 users," 27%).

Those answering the survey were highly experienced: 71% had spent 10 or more years as a library professional. They also represented a variety of roles, including director or assistant director, serials librarian, e-resources librarian, acquisitions librarian, and collection development or collection management librarian. The group also was quite experienced with online journal collections: 65% either were "solely responsible" or "shared responsibility" for online journal purchasing and cancellation decisions, while another 26% indicated that they provided "input and feedback" to decision-makers regarding online journal purchasing and cancelling decisions.

What Are Librarians Analyzing — and Why?

Most of the librarians responding to our survey (80%) are analyzing at least a portion of their online journal holdings, with 37% indicating that they analyze usage statistics for "75% to 100%" of their holdings and another quarter (25%) noting that they analyze usage statistics for at least "50 to 75%" of their holdings. (See Figure 1, below.)




Respondents were asked an open-ended question about the factors driving the level of current analysis. Those whose libraries had lower analysis levels across their online journal holdings often reported that many of their online journals did not provide readily-accessible statistics or offered no statistics at all; others cited a lack of personnel resources or low institutional interest in usage statistics analysis.

The qualitative feedback from these librarians about their motivations for analyzing usage statistics also reveals the need for deeper understanding of the value of the holding. One librarian explained that the goal of analysis was to "prove to our stakeholders ... that we are good stewards of the money and that we actually use the materials."

And in this era of tight budgets, most libraries clearly aren't likely to offer free rides to journals that don't demonstrate an acceptable performance for the expenditure. "We analyze to make sure our journals are being used," another librarian noted. "If they are not, we consider cancelling them to get access to journals that will get used."

The new paradigm of performance accountability for journals is evidenced by the decisions or actions of librarians in light of usage statistics or journal metrics. Among respondents to our survey, 98% reported that their library used usage statistics to make "cancellation and/or renewal decisions," 72% indicated that they employed usage statistics for "journal package negotiations," and 72% said usage statistics were factored into "budget justifications." (See Figure 2, below.)




continued on page 51

The Benefit of Getting Everyone on the Same Page ... from page 50


The statistic — or metric — most used by librarians who responded to our survey was “COUNTER-compliant reports for full-text requests” (90%), with “cost per use” being a close second (87%). Other metrics frequently used for usage analysis by our respondents: “interlibrary loan/document requests” (68%), “non-COUNTER compliant full-text requests” (58%), “Journal Impact Factor” (39%), and “Journal Citation Reports” (31%).

Significantly, while a variety of statistics and metrics are increasingly being employed to help make online journal holdings decisions, a qualitative component is still important: 80% of study participants reported that “faculty recommendations and/or input” was used to make decisions about online journals. (See Figure 3, below.)



It Takes a Village to Dread It

The task of collecting usage data falls to a variety of job roles within the libraries of our survey respondents. It's no surprise that those with an “e-” in front of their job title are likely to be cozy with usage-stats spreadsheets, as 49% of participants reported that an e-resources librarian was responsible for collecting usage statistics. But at least some responsibility is shared by librarians in many other roles, including collection development and collection management librarians (26%), administrative staff (16%), serials librarians (12%), a director or an assistant director (11%), acquisitions librarians (9%), and third-party providers (8%).




While the collection development and/or management librarians were most often cited (56%) as being responsible for analyzing journal-usage data, a wide range of job roles are sharing in the role of analyst. E-resources librarians (41%), directors or assistant directors (31%), acquisitions librarians (17%), and serials librarians (14%) all may be involved in analysis. Survey participants indicated that a multitude of others also may analyze data: open-ended responses to specify “Other” (22%) included teams and committees of various designations (electronic resources committee, collection development team, library collection council group, etc.), as well as individuals, such as subject librarians and faculty/departamental liaisons.

Homegrown Analytics Solutions Doing the Heavy Lifting

To process, analyze, and report online journal-usage data and statistics, most respondents reported that their libraries depend on an “in-house solution using spreadsheets” (52%) or a combination of in-house means and a proprietary usage-analysis tool (39%), such as *Swets Scholarly Stats*, *Serials Solutions 360 Counter*, or *EBSCONET Usage Consolidation*. (See Figure 4, top right.)


FIGURE 4: Primary method used to process, analyze, and report on online journal-usage statistics and metrics



Those using only a commercial, spreadsheet-based (Excel, Access, Lotus, etc.), homegrown solution to crunch and report usage data seem to be divided as to the effectiveness of this method. While 35% “strongly agreed” or “agreed” with the statement “I’m satisfied with the in-house solution that our library currently uses,” 20% either “disagreed” or “strongly disagreed” with the same statement and 18% at least “somewhat disagreed.”

Respondents who reported using a proprietary usage-analysis tool seem to be somewhat underwhelmed by the performance of third-party systems, with only 5% indicating they were “totally satisfied” with their proprietary usage-analysis tool and another 51% saying they were “satisfied.” However, the lack of high levels of overall dissatisfaction — 10% were “somewhat dissatisfied” and only 6% were “totally dissatisfied” — suggests that while proprietary solutions are not yet perfected, they do perform a job that librarians certainly value. (See Figure 5, below.)

FIGURE 5: Satisfaction with Library's Primary Proprietary Online Journal Usage-Analysis tool or Module



The Future of Usage Statistics: This All Better Get Better

It's evident to the librarians participating in this survey that library serials-collection decisions will be increasingly driven by usage statistics and other metrics. It's equally believed, however, that the complexities of collecting, processing, analyzing, and reporting data remains problematic and burdensome. Nonetheless, librarians appear to be shifting from a mindset of “something is better than nothing” to one of “I want more, and I want it to be more usable.”

When participants were asked in an open-ended, wind-up question about what they envision for the future of usage statistics and metrics, one librarian from a large university offered the following observation: “It still needs to improve. The work involved in gathering, compiling, and analyzing stats is tremendous, and it needs to be simplified.”

Experimentation is evidently the norm for many librarians, as they seek to successfully capture and leverage usage information, and they want relief from the frustration of speculative efforts. One law librarian said, “I hope that this will become more integrated with the resources and that we won't have to try so many different ways to capture statistics for different publishers.”

continued on page 52

Pelikan's Antidisambiguation — Size, Money, Risk

Column Editor: **Michael P. Pelikan** (Penn State) <mp10@psu.edu>

The rise of the iPad has had a shaping influence on the business of publishing and selling digital content, among which reading material still has a role to play. I think it's too much to say that the iPad has defined the device market, insofar as it was, itself, produced in response to other devices that scooped out sections of beach, creating tidal pools. Apple took a look and thought the water looked pretty good. So, yes, the iPad (and its joined-at-the-hip little brother, the iPhone) have showed up at the beach, carrying a big shovel, and stomping with big feet across the carefully-created castles, aqueducts, and moats created by the smaller kids.

Apple can dominate, but it doesn't always initiate, despite the popular folklore. Nevertheless, once on the scene, all must respond, work around, or find some way to weather the presence on the playing field of the supremely confident rich kid.

Rich kids sometimes like to make their own rules. The 30% cut on any content sold through their boutique is a nice example. For the matter, so is the exclusivity of that boutique itself. True, while the other e-matter retailers compete with each other by offering service, storage, access, etc., to persuade you to "eat in" rather than "take out," only Apple never lets you leave the mall. For those who are willing to invest the time to learn a few rudimentary stitches, making movable the content one has licensed from these other boutiques is fairly simple. Perhaps I'm old-fashioned, but the idea of locally-held backup copies of content I've "purchased" quiets the mind. Now again, to be precise, I really don't mean "purchased" — we hardly purchase anything anymore — at least not digital stuff — I mean content for which I have paid a licensing fee and to which I therefore have access.

But back to the story. The tablet market existed before Apple did its can-

nonball into the pool. It just wasn't particularly fashionable. A tablet was functional, ideally-suited to certain kinds of uses, but nobody saw it as a fashion accessory. It wasn't the iPad that changed all that, however. It was the Kindle. For a couple to a few hundred dollars, you could have a very elegant, nicely-made device that could carry your entire library, consolidated into a single, slim device. Even better, you could buy a rainbow of covers and accessories to personalize your Kindle, to make it really say something about who you are. And best yet, at least from Amazon's perspective, you could shop for, purchase, and download new content anywhere, directly to the device, at impulse purchase pricing. All in all, a really good deal for everybody, even the publishers, once they gave up the fight and agreed to do it Amazon's way.

Apple doesn't like not being the flashiest dress on the red carpet. If Amazon bared a shoulder, Apple was, by golly, going to show just how far a neckline could be made to plunge, and the laws of physics be damned.

Out came the iPad — the device that made it not only fashionable to carry a tablet, but made it mandatory, at least, if one wished to remain among the elect. Oh, and you content providers, we're offering you the most desirable address on the street, so a 30% cut to the store is a bargain — really it is, Dears, for after all, that's simply how the game is played, and we all know it.

Well, the iPad was nice, though a bit spendy for the consumer. Not professional laptop spendy, not quite, but a little more than consumer camera spendy. More than simply an impulse purchase, yet not entirely out of reach — so really, it was more like a life decision: one with a comparatively modest financial threshold for

entry, but promising proportionally great rewards from a lifestyle perspective. Really a no-brainer. One had to have one.


After all, it could do what the Kindle did, and so much more. Certainly, you could carry your entire library, but you could also surf the Web (in color, no less), buy music (from iTunes), and play games (purchased from Apple). Never mind that the iPad's battery life was measured in hours rather than weeks. Never mind that it was heavier than the Kindle, and bigger, too.

The vast and diverse capabilities of the iPad were a selling point, but there remained a market for devices centered on reading. The electrophoretic display of the Kindle was unsurpassed for readability, especially outdoors or anywhere the gleamingly shiny screen of the iPad became a liability rather than an asset. A friend of mine who was an early buyer of the iPad (but kept his Kindle) observed that the iPad was actually a multi-hundred-dollar mirror, which you could also use as a tablet under the right conditions.

Amazon, however, was quick to recognize the threat that the iPad represented — and so did Barnes and Noble, and Sony too, neither of whom I've actually forgotten to mention. In fact, it was Barnes and Noble who fired the first responding salvo with the introduction of the Nook Color. An Android device, actually, which brought Google into the story. Google has been there all along, really. Android smartphones had emerged as more than an irritant to Apples planned domination of the smartphone market — much more, in fact, a genuine threat. Apple wasn't the only player in the game in which smartphone users were using their smartphones like little tablets. Barnes and Noble and Kindle and Sony leapt in with Android apps, effectively turning your Android phone into a Kindle, a Nook, a Sony Reader, or all three.

Well, this was the point in the story at which the biggest pie fight in history (except

continued on page 53



The Benefit of Getting Everyone on the Same Page ... from page 51

The desire on the part of librarians for better access to COUNTER-compliant data from publishers was a standard echo across the feedback from the participants in our study. But some are looking beyond titles, packages, and publishers to discipline-level analytics. According to one subject librarian, the ability to integrate disciplinary data silos could, in turn, help eliminate budgetary silos.

Many librarians predicted a coming shift to pay-per-view models, which would reduce the need to rely on usage statistics analytics. A number of these librarians also noted that eBook usage statistics would soon be a key part of the overall conversation.

In addition, there seems to be ample room for vendors to improve proprietary usage-analysis tools. This vision was offered by a medical

school serials librarian, who summed up an ideal solution: "One day I could imagine the development of an integrated usage collection and analysis tool that relies on all the metrics described in this survey and can be used by librarians in determining journal value based on usage."

Some outlooks are a bit pessimistic. For instance, one collections development librarian foresees "continued spotty coverage, unreliable data collection, and lack of cooperation among vendors."

Despite the frustrations and challenges related to usage statistics and the means by which they are leveraged, the overall consensus is that improvement is inevitable in standardization and integration across the continuum. Where most agree, though, is that this evolution will require a partnering of libraries, publishers, and agents.

Ultimately, our ATG survey reveals that usage statistics will prove most useful — for librarians, students, researchers, and even my sympathetic friends — when all segments of the information industry get on the same page. 🌱